REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

a mean-squared error minimization that is constrained according to a weighted spectral flatness term

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 13, 14, 15 and 16 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee in view of Fertner. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As to claim 1, the Examiner has stated that

> "Mukherjee does not disclose the coefficients derived according to a mean-squared error minimization constrained according to a spectral flatness, however Fertner discloses the coefficients of the digital filter of the time-domain equalizer (fig 3, 53) are selected by minimizing negative effects of interference with a mean squared error (MSE) term (col 5, lines 58-62)." (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that claim 1 recites that the mean-squared error minimization **is constrained** according to a weighted spectral flatness term. Neither of the cited references teaches this limitation. In fact, Fertner states that "[v]alues of the cost function are determined for different offsets, and the offset that produces the smallest cost function value (corresponding to the minimum mean-square error) is selected." (*See* Abstract, emphasis added). Further, Fertner describes the "offset" n_0` as "associated with unknown delay introduced by the chanel n_0..." (Col. 7, lines 63-67). Thus, neither of the cited references individually or in combination teach constraining the mean-squared error minimization according to a weighted spectral flatness term as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify this

limitation. Therefore, the cited references do not teach each and every limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable form the combination of cited references.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 6 and 13 have been rejected in the manner of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 6 and 13 are patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The Examiner has objected to claim 9, as "being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that claim 9 is an independent claim and does not depend from any other claim. Accordinlgy, Applicants believe that claim 9 and those depend therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137